

REMARKS

Claims 3, 9-10, and 21 have been amended in order to improve the form only, no claims have been cancelled, new claim 39 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-39 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

OBJECTIONS

Claims 3, 9 and 21 stand objected to for various informalities. The claims have been amended in conformity with the Office's comments.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 13-20 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley, U.S. Patent No. 5,721,842 in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and in further view of Rothenberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,432,850.

Beasley is directed to a computerized switching system for coupling a workstation to a remotely located computer. The Beasley system contains a crosspoint switch that allows input cards to transmit signals to and receive signals from up to eight of the remotely located server computers, while each of the output cards transmit to and receive signals from up to eight of the remotely located workstations Beasley Fig. 4, column 6 lines 14-20. The AAPA teaches a method that allows a user of a terminal to switch between a private computer and a network computer.

Claim 1 recites inter alia:

a security unit that executes, for each terminal, identification processing of data that has been received from any one terminal and output to the at least one private computer or the shared computer, the identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the at least one terminal is connected, the identification processing enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner correlates the switch card address of Beasley with the claimed identifier corresponding to a connector. Applicants respectfully submit that a card (switch card being one type of card), by definition, is a printed circuit board populated with many components whereas a connector is one particular component which may

or may not be one of many components on a printed circuit board. Thus, Beasley does not teach or suggest the claimed “identifier corresponding to a connector,” because a connector has an address separate and different from the card address.

Second, on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner correlates “the identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector” feature of the independent claims with the data encrypted using one or both of the destination address and the source address as encryption keys limitation of Rothenburg. This correlation presumes that the identifier corresponding to a connector is a source or destination address, however, the connector is not the source of data but rather the terminal is the source. Thus, Rothenburg does not teach or suggest the claimed “identifier corresponding to a connector,” because the identifier corresponding to a connector is not a source or destination of data.

Third, on page 8, the Office Action contends that although Rothenburg discloses encyphering of data via use of an IP address as an identifier, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Rothenburg’s teachings could be applied to other types of networks and using other types of identifiers/addresses including a switch card address. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims do not recite use of types of identifiers/addresses associated with a network, such as a switch card address, but rather an identifier “corresponding to a connector.” Applicant also respectfully submits that use of such identifiers/addresses pertaining to a network or inherent to a device such as a switch card address would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically, switch card addresses and other addresses associated with networks are easily discoverable in a network, and would not satisfactorily serve as key information when it is desirable in a security system for key information to be secret. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that there lacks an adequate motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art.

For at least the reasons stated above, the combination of Beasley, AAPA and Rothenberg taken separately or in combination fails to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 7, 13, 17 and 38 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 4, 10 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Beasley in view of AAPA, in further view of Rothenberg and in further view of Wilder, U.S. Patent No. 6,557,170. Wilder adds nothing to Beasley, AAPA and Rothenberg as argued above with respect to the independent claims and therefore, the combination of Beasley, AAPA, Rothenberg and Wilder fails to teach or suggest the elements of claims 4, 10 and 25-28.

Claims 5-6, 11-12 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Beasley in view of AAPA, in further view of Rothenberg and in further view of Onsen, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,811. Onsen adds nothing to Beasley, AAPA and Rothenberg as argued above with respect to the independent claims and therefore, the combination of Beasley, AAPA, Rothenberg and Onsen fails to teach or suggest the elements of claims 5-6, 11-12 and 29-36.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that Claims 3, 9 and 21-24 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action. As mentioned above, Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

NEW CLAIM 39

New claim 39 recites inter alia:

an identification processing unit coupled to the connection unit utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the terminal is connected as an enciphering key, the identification processing unit enciphering a received key code,

wherein said identifier is stored in RAM of both said shared computer and said private computer connected by said connection unit.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 39 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that claims 1-39 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-14-08

By: 

Aaron C. Walker
Reg. No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501